

Question 3: While the stratification of work zone regulations may make sense , guidelines need to be done on a state by state level to assure we are addressing the state's issues.

Question 4: It might help to have a common definition for a work zone . But there is a need to address the needs of each of the organizations that use the definition. Having one definition with multiple footnotes may not work.

Questions 5 - 7: The planning processes should note the availability of alternate routes and the impact on local communities with the changed traffic patterns.

Question 6: Cross-cutting policy issues and transportation planning, while a reasonable idea, really may not make as much sense as first thought. Coming up with life-cycle costing, durable materials, etc. should be covered under the greater policy umbrella of the state transportation organization, not just a planning function.

Question 10: The document is asking if we should include in the plans ITS utilization to speed up traffic and notify the public of duration and alternate routes. In AZ the construction group already partners with ITS when appropriate without including it on the plan.

Questions 8 - 9: FHWA needs to review construction contracting requirements along with the work zone safety requirements to assure there are opportunities for alternative bidding processes and the use of innovative design techniques. A point of argument on every project is the use of the "Green Book" standards for safety through the work zone and the highway itself does not meet those standards. States should be provided the opportunity to develop our work zones in terms of present highway conditions and how traffic reacts to the zone itself. Don't suggest software for use in rulemaking.

Questions 11 - 14: Encouraging the use of different technologies to inform the public is a good idea and the standardization of some of the sign messages and developing the mechanisms to have local law enforcement enforce the messages would help. The role of the TCPs should be based on individual project scopes and local community needs. The questions are worded like TCPs would be a requirement.

Question 12: The document is asking if Traffic Control Plans (TCPs) should have security concerns in them. If we have security concerns we should partner with the AZ Department of Public Safety and try to address them that way, and not make it a practice to do it ourselves. We'd take on a very important and serious issue that is better left to the Public Safety experts.

Question 14: The document is asking who should develop TCPs? Contractors, municipalities, Law Enforcement? should certification be required? A professional should utilize the MUTCD to develop the TCP and it should be set up accordingly. This is a liability issue. It is fine to partner. In AZ we require plans to be sealed, and I recommend it stays that way. If the contractor has changes, then the resident engineer (responsible for the construction, and is a P.E.) would take on responsibility of approval.

Question 15: Mobility and safety audits are really a part of determining the effectiveness of the traffic control in a work zone and, at least within Arizona, we do some of this during routine inspections.

Question 16 - 17: Public involvement regarding work zones should be obtained during the project development process, it need not be a requirement. The use of community or public relation firms should be encouraged and setup as a standard part of all contracts.

Question 18 : The document is asking if states should report data (ADT, Delays ...) on work zones. Since it will take time, equipment and personnel, and it would not be funded, then states will not be able to.

Question 19: To determine mobility we need to measure delay, travel time, and speed approaching, through, and leaving a work zone.

Question 20: The factors outlined are appropriate in measuring some of the effectiveness of the work zone safety. Getting records is not a clean function especially on federal and Indian lands.